

Remarks

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 21-23, 30, 38, 42, 59, and 62 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-24 and 26-66 are pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 11, 21, 38, and 62

Claims 1, 11, 21, 38, and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389, in view of Qureshi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,084,582.

Amended claim 1 recites:

... *means for displaying an icon representing the recorded audio narration comprising a non-numeric, visual representation corresponding to a length of the audio narration...*

Claim 62 similarly recites means for displaying a non-numeric, visual representation of the length of audio narrations.

Amended claim 11 recites:

... *displaying an icon representing the recorded audio narration comprising a non-numeric, visual representation corresponding to a length of the audio narration...*

Claims 21 and 38 recite similar limitations concerning non-numeric, visual representations of the length of audio narrations.

The Examiner cited Qureshi col. 2, lines 42-60 as teaching the claimed non-numeric, visual representation of the length of the audio narrations. However, the cited

lines of Qureshi teach only that the time lengths of audio narrations are determined and stored with the corresponding slides in the same computer file for the purpose of automatically advancing to the next slide at the end of each audio segment. Qureshi does not teach that any sort of icon for each narration, much less as a non-numeric, visual representation of the length of the narration, an example of which is shown by items 130 and 135 in the applicants' Fig. 1.

Furthermore, Morris is not cited to teach, nor does it teach, the claimed visual representation of the length of audio narrations. Because neither Morris nor Qureshi teach or disclose the claimed visual representation of the length of audio narrations, no combination of Morris and Qureshi can render claims 1, 11, 21, 38, and 62 obvious.

Claims 2, 4-10, 12, 14-20, 22-24, 26-37, 39-61, and 63-66

Claims 2, 4-10, 12, 14-20, 22-24, 26-37, 39-61, and 63-66 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris in view of Qureshi. However, each of these claims depend from and include the limitations of at least one of the independent claims, 1, 11, 21, 38, and 62. As such claims 2, 4-10, 12, 14-20, 22-24, 26-37, 39-61, and 63-66 cannot be rendered obvious by Morris and Qureshi for at least the reasons set forth with respect to the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-24 and 26-66 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present

Application No. 09/465,982
Amendment dated July 1, 2004
Response to Office Action of March 1, 2004

Atty. Docket No. 074451.P108
Examiner Mylinh Tran
TC/A.U. 2174

application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit
Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: July 1, 2004


Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

1 July 2004
Date of Deposit

DEBORAH L. HIGGINS
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Sophie O. 7-1-04
Signature Date